

INFLUENCE OF INDEPENDENT BENT-UP BARS ON THE SHEAR CAPACITY OF REINFORCED CONCRETE BEAMS

SALEH ABDULLAH SALEH BARAS

A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Civil-Structure)

Faculty of Civil Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JANUARY, 2013

To my beloved parents, brothers, sisters and friends.....

Especially to,

My father, who found in his heart the well

And tolerances to allow me follow my dreams and aspirations.....

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It has not been an easy mission reaching this stage where I graduate and start a whole new mission in life. I owe many thanks to all those who have made it possible, first on the list is my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ramli Bin Abdullah. I thank him for the great guidance he provided me with.

Next on the list is UTM (Universiti Teknologi Malaysia), my beloved university that never disappointed us and always exceeded our expectations as students. The lab facilities and the fantastic lab staff were one of the most contributing factors that facilitated the experimental works and made it accomplishable within the time limit. Not to mention the library and the resources which were made available for us to exploit and benefit from throughout the research and the experimental work.

Last but not least, I owe great thanks to my beloved family that supported me all the way despite the distance. No matter what decision I made, my family was always there for me supporting and pushing me forward and for that no thanks are enough to express my gratitude.

ABSTRACT

Reinforced concrete beams are designed to resist bending due to applied moments; however it is equally important to design them for shear in order to avoid sudden failure due to shear forces. This paper aims at studying the effectiveness and feasibility of the use of independent bent-up bars systems as shear reinforcement. The proposed systems are to replace the conventional stirrups and stand alone as shear reinforcement. The effect of different parameter involved in the shear phenomenon were reviewed in order to better understand the behavior of reinforced concrete beams when exposed to shearing forces. For verification, a beam with conventional stirrups was used as a control specimen to which the results obtained were compared. As was expected, all the proposed systems provided better shear resistance than the control; beam, this can be seen by the maximum loads at which they failed, the less cracks formed in the shear spans and by the type of failure where they all failed in bending except for specimen B6. B1 failed at load 220 kN, this beam was the control beams reinforced in shear with R6-50mm links. B2, B3, B4, B5 and B6 failed at 245kN, 230kN, 230kN, 240kN and 240kN, respectively. Specimen B2 was reinforced with least amount of shear reinforcement of all the specimens, about 20 percent less than the control specimen, yet showed the highest resistance and the highest ductility where it failed at load 240kN and a maximum deflection of 24.51mm. Similarly specimen B4 failed at 230 kN and had relatively high ductility where the maximum deflection occurred at failure was 21.71mm. On the other hand B3, B5 and B6 still provided more shear resistance than the control beam, however showed very low ductility where the beams failed at maximum deflections of 10.5mm, 9.91mm and 10.22mm, respectively. All in all, independent bent-up bar systems are effective in resisting shear and hence; should be used on their own and not only if combined with stirrups.

ABSTRAK

Rasuk konkrit bertetulang direkabentuk untuk merintang lenturan disebabkan perletakkan momen; walaubagaimanapun kepentingannya sama pada rekabentuk ricih dalam mengelakkan kegagalan mendadak disebabkan daya ricih. Kajian ini bertujuan mengkaji keberkesanan dan kebolehlaksanaan penggunaan sistem bar bengkok atas bebas sebagai tetulang ricih. Kesan parameter yang berbeza juga terlibat di dalam fenomena ricih dikaji semula dalam usaha memahami kelakuan ricih pada rasuk konkrit bertetulang. Rasuk tetulang pugak konvensional telah digunakan sebagai specimen kawalan dimana hasil keputusan yang didapati telah dibandingkan. Seperti yang telah dijangkakan, kesemua sistem yang telah dicadangkan menyediakan rintangan ricih yang lebih baik daripada kawalan; rasuk, ini dapat dilihat pada beban maksimum kegagalan berlaku, keretakan terbentuk berkurangan pada rentangan ricih dan dimana kesemuanya gagal dalam lenturan kecuali specimen B6. B1 telah gagal pada beban 220 kN, rasuk ini adalah rasuk bertetulang kawalan dengan ricih R6-50mm tetulang pugak. B2, B3, B4, B5 and B6 telah gagal pada 245kN, 230kN, 230kN, 240kN dan 240kN. Specimen B2 dengan tetulang ricih yang paling sedikit, kira-kira 20 peratus kurang daripada specimen kawalan, menunjukkan rintangan dan kemuluran tertinggi dimana kegagalan berlaku pada beban 240kN dan pesongan maksimum sebanyak 24.51mm. Specimen B4 gagal pada 230kN dan mempunyai kemuluran agak tinggi dimana pesongan maksimum berlaku pada 21.71mm. Sebaliknya B3, B5 dan B6 masih menyediakan lebih rintangan ricih daripada rasuk kawalan, walau bagaimanapun menunjukkan kemuluran yang terendah dimana rasuk gagal pada pesongan maksimum 10.5mm, 9.91mm dan 10.22mm. Secara kesimpulannya, penggunaan sistem bar bengkok atas bebas adalah berkesan dalam merintang ricih dan ia sepatutnya digunakan sendiri dan bukan sahaja dikombinasikan dengan tetulang pugak ricih.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | TITLE | PAGE |
|--------------|---|------|
| | DECLARATION | ii |
| | DEDICATION | iii |
| | ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iv |
| | ABSTRACT | v |
| | ABSTRAK | vi |
| | TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| | LIST OF TABLES | xi |
| | LIST OF FIGURES | xii |
| | LIST OF SYMBOLS | xvi |
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | |
| | 1.1 Background | 1 |
| | 1.2 Problem Statement | 2 |
| | 1.3 Objectives of the Study | 3 |
| | 1.4 Scope of the Study | 3 |
| 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | |
| | 2.1 Introduction | 5 |
| | 2.2 Modes of Failure in Beams without Shear Reinforcement | 9 |

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| 2.2.1 | Diagonal Tension Failure | 9 |
| 2.2.2 | Shear Compression Failure | 10 |
| 2.2.3 | Splitting “True Shear” | 10 |
| 2.3 | Variables influencing the Shear Strength of RC Beams | 11 |
| 2.3.1 | Effect of Shear Span-to-Depth Ration (a/d) | 11 |
| 2.3.2 | Effect of the Compressive of Concrete, f_{ck} | 12 |
| 2.3.3 | Effect of Tensile Reinforcement Ratio, ρ | 14 |
| 2.3.4 | Effect of Flexural Member Size | 16 |
| 2.4 | Crack Shear and Ultimate Shear Strengths | 17 |
| 2.5 | Different Configurations of Shear Reinforcement | 19 |
| 2.6 | Shear Design in Codes of Practice | 20 |
| 2.7 | Members Not Requiring the Design of Shear Reinforcement | 20 |
| 2.7.1 | Requirements in BS 8110-1:1997 | 20 |
| 2.7.2 | Requirements in BS EN 1992-1-1:2004 | 22 |
| 2.8 | Member Requiring the Design of Shear Reinforcement | 23 |
| 2.8.1 | Requirements in BS 8110-1:1997 | 23 |
| 2.8.1.1 | Stirrups (Vertical shear Links) | 24 |
| 2.8.1.2 | Bent-up Bars | 26 |
| 2.8.2 | Requirements in BS EN 1992-1-1:2004 | 31 |
| 2.8.2.1 | Members with Vertical Shear Reinforcement | 32 |
| 2.8.2.2 | Members with Inclined Shear Reinforcement | 33 |
| 2.8.2.3 | Members with Bent-Up Bars | 33 |
| 2.9 | Summary | 35 |

3

EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

| | | |
|-------|---------------|----|
| 3.1 | Materials | 37 |
| 3.1.1 | Formwork | 37 |
| 3.1.2 | Concrete | 38 |
| 3.3.3 | Reinforcement | 39 |

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| 3.2 | Specimens Preparation | 39 |
| 3.2.1 | Design of Control Specimen, B1 | 39 |
| 3.2.2 | Reinforcement Arrangements in the Specimens | 41 |
| 3.2.2.1 | Specimen B1 | 41 |
| 3.2.2.2 | Specimen B2 | 43 |
| 3.2.2.3 | Specimen B3 | 44 |
| 3.2.2.4 | Specimen B4 | 45 |
| 3.2.2.5 | Specimen B5 | 45 |
| 3.2.2.6 | Specimen B6 | 46 |
| 3.2.3 | Casting the Specimens | 48 |
| 3.3 | Testing Method | 50 |
| 3.4 | Summary | 52 |

4 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

| | | |
|---------|--------------------------------|----|
| 4.1 | Cubes Compressive Test Results | 53 |
| 4.2 | Beam Results | 55 |
| 4.2.1 | Specimen B1 | 55 |
| 4.2.1.1 | Specimen's Behavior | 56 |
| 4.2.1.2 | Test Results | 57 |
| 4.2.2 | Specimen B2 | 58 |
| 4.2.2.1 | Specimen's Behavior | 58 |
| 4.2.2.2 | Test Results | 59 |
| 4.2.3 | Specimen B3 | 61 |
| 4.2.3.1 | Specimen's Behavior | 61 |
| 4.2.3.2 | Test Results | 62 |
| 4.2.4 | Specimen B4 | 64 |
| 4.2.4.1 | Specimen's Behavior | 64 |
| 4.2.4.2 | Test Results | 66 |
| 4.2.5 | Specimen B5 | 67 |
| 4.2.5.1 | Specimen's Behavior | 67 |
| 4.2.5.2 | Test Results | 69 |
| 4.2.6 | Specimen B6 | 70 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.2.6.1 Specimen's Behavior | 70 |
| 4.2.6.2 Test Results | 72 |
| 4.3 Summary of Test Results | 74 |
| | |
| 5 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION | |
| | |
| 5.1 Analysis and Discussion of Test Results | 77 |
| 5.1.1 Shear Resistance | 77 |
| 5.1.2 Modes of Failure | 81 |
| 5.1.3 Deflection Analysis | 83 |
| 5.2 Summary | 84 |
| | |
| 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | |
| | |
| 6.1 Conclusion | 86 |
| 6.2 Recommendations | 87 |
| | |
| References | 88 |
| Bibliography | 89 |
| Appendices | 90 |

LIST OF TABLE

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| 2.1 | Values of v_c provided in BS8110 | 22 |
| 2.2 | Form and area of shear reinforcement in beams (BS8110-1:1997) | 25 |
| 2.3 | β values provided in BS8110: part 1 Clause 3.12.8.4, table 3.26 | 31 |
| 4.1 | Cubes compressive strengths | 54 |
| 4.2 | Summary of the shear reinforcement arrangements in the six specimens | 74 |
| 4.3 | Summary of the lab test results | 75 |
| 5.1 | Percentage difference of maximum loads at failure compared to the control specimen, B1. | 80 |
| 5.2 | Theoretical and experimental shear resistance values | 80 |
| 5.3 | Shear reinforcement and the failure location | 82 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| 2.1 | A beam tested for shear under point loading | 7 |
| 2.2 | Shear stress in a rectangular beam of a uniform section | 8 |
| 2.3 | Configuration of diagonal tension cracks | 9 |
| 2.4 | Configuration of a web shear crack | 10 |
| 2.5 | Shear crack configuration when the shear span is less than the effective depth of the member | 11 |
| 2.6 | Shear span and effective depth definition | 12 |
| 2.7 | Beam section reinforced with I section, longitudinal reinforcement, and transverse web reinforcement ¹ | 13 |
| 2.8 | Beam section reinforced with longitudinal reinforcement | 14 |
| 2.9 | Effect of tensile reinforcement ratio on shear strength of flexural member | 15 |
| 2.10 | Beams of different sizes tested to study the effect of size on shear strength | 17 |
| 2.11 | Effect of different tensile reinforcement ratios on V_c and V_u | 19 |
| 2.12 | Different stirrups configurations | 25 |
| 2.13 | Different inclined system configurations | 27 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| 2.14 (a) | Equivalent single truss system; | 28 |
| 2.14 (b) | Inclined bars crossing Crack | 28 |
| 2.15 | Truss model for the design of shear reinforcement (BS EN 1992-1-1:2004) | 32 |
| 2.16 (a) | Single bent-up bars system | 34 |
| 2.16 (b) | Multiple bent-up bars system | 34 |
| 3.1 | Formwork prepared for the casting of the six beams | 38 |
| 3.2 | Specimens cross-section and tensile reinforcement | 40 |
| 3.3 | Stress block diagram for the proposed cross-section | 40 |
| 3.4 | Reinforcement arrangements in the control specimen B1 | 42 |
| 3.5 | Shear links in specimen B1 after being fixed in place | 42 |
| 3.6 | Reinforcement arrangements in specimen B2 | 43 |
| 3.7 | Reinforcement arrangements in specimen B3 | 44 |
| 3.8 | Reinforcement arrangements in specimen B4 | 45 |
| 3.9 | Reinforcement arrangements in specimen B5 | 46 |
| 3.10 | Reinforcement arrangements in specimen B6 | 47 |
| 3.11 | Stiffeners used to ensure the dimensional details of the beams | 48 |
| 3.12 | Test specimens and cubes covered with a plastic cover | 48 |
| 3.13 | Test specimens after removing the formwork | 49 |
| 3.14 | Schematic of the testing frame | 50 |
| 3.15 | The actual testing frame after placing a test specimen | 51 |
| 3.16 | LVDTs used to measure beam deflections at multiple locations | 51 |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| 3.17 | The concrete strain gauge attached to the surface of the concrete | 52 |
| 4.1 | Cube compressive strength development from the casting day to the last testing day | 55 |
| 4.2 | Specimen B1 at failure with close ups at failure points and cracking in the shear spans | 56 |
| 4.3 | Load-deflection behavior for specimen B1 | 57 |
| 4.4 | Specimen B2 at failure with close ups at failure points and cracking in the shear spans | 59 |
| 4.5 | Load-deflection behavior for specimen B2 | 60 |
| 4.6 | Load-strain behavior on both sides of specimen B2 | 60 |
| 4.7 | Specimen B3 at failure with close ups at failure points and cracking in the shear spans | 62 |
| 4.8 | Load-deflection behavior for specimen B2 | 63 |
| 4.9 | Load-strain behavior on both sides of specimen B3 | 63 |
| 4.10 | Specimen B4 at failure with close ups at failure points and cracking in the shear spans | 65 |
| 4.11 | Load-deflection behavior for specimen B4 | 66 |
| 4.12 | Load-strain behavior in specimen B4 | 66 |
| 4.13 | Specimen B5 at failure | 67 |
| 4.14 (a) | Left hand side shear span where shear cracks are not visible | 68 |
| 4.14 (b) | Right hand side shear span where one clear shear crack occurred | 68 |
| 4.15 | Load-deflection behavior for specimen B4 | 69 |
| 4.16 | Load-strain behavior in specimen B5 | 70 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 4.17 | Specimen B6 at failure | 71 |
| 4.18 | Crack pattern in the shear span in specimen B6 | 72 |
| 4.19 | Load-deflection behavior for specimen B6 | 73 |
| 4.20 | Load-strain behavior in specimen B6 | 73 |
| 5.1 | Ultimate loads at failure of the six specimens | 79 |
| 5.2 | Maximum deflections obtained at failure | 83 |
| 5.3 | Comparison of the deflections obtained for the six specimens | 84 |

LIST OF SYMBOLS

| | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| A | - | Area of a cross-section |
| A_s | - | Area of tension reinforcement |
| A_{sw} | - | Cross-sectional area of shear reinforcement as links or bent-up |
| $A_{s,prov}$ | - | Area of tension reinforcement provided |
| $A_{s, req}$ | - | Area of tension reinforcement required |
| A_{sv} | - | Total cross-sectional area of links at the neutral axis |
| a_v | - | Shear span |
| b | - | Width of a section |
| b_v | - | Breadth of member for shear resistance |
| c | - | Cover to reinforcement |
| d | - | Effective depth of tension reinforcement |
| f_{ck} | - | Characteristic concrete cube strength at 28 days |
| f_{yk} | - | Characteristic strength of reinforcement |
| L | - | Effective span of a beam |
| M | - | Bending moment |
| S_b | - | Spacing of bent-up bars |
| S_v | - | Spacing of links |

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| V | - | Shear force at ultimate design load |
| V_b | - | Design ultimate shear resistance of bent-up bars |
| V_c | - | Design ultimate shear resistance of a concrete section |
| v | - | Shear stress |
| v_b | - | Design shear stress resistance of bent-up bars |
| v_c | - | Design ultimate shear stress resistance of a singly reinforced concrete beam |
| $V_{Rd,c}$ | - | Concrete shear capacity based on Eurocode 2 |
| α | - | Angle between a bent-up bar and the axis of a beam |
| ρ_o | - | The reference ration = $\sqrt{fck} / 1000$ |
| ρ | - | The required tension reinforcement ratio at mid-span to resist moment due to the design loads |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Beams are designed to resist deflection due to applied moment; however this is not adequate because there are other failures that are more dangerous than flexural failure. Shear failure or more properly termed as “Diagonal Tension Failure” is one example of those failures that could lead to the collapse of the beam if it is not designed properly to resist the applied shear stress.

The beam is designed first for flexural resistance, and then checked if it is requiring the design of special shear reinforcement. The check is dependent on the shear stress applied compared to the shear capacity of the section before considering the shear reinforcement. The main goal of the design is to make sure that the beam fails in flexural before shear.

There are two types of inclined cracks in reinforced concrete beams: flexural shear cracking and web shear cracking. The web shear cracking occurs at the point when the principal tensile stresses exceed the concrete tensile strength. On the other

hand, the flexural cracking occurs when the shear and tensile stresses exceed the tensile strength of the concrete. The web shear cracks usually occur near the supports, while the flexural cracking occur, while the flexural cracks occur in the mid-span where the moment is maximum, in simply supported beams for example.

In reinforced concrete beams with no shear reinforcement, the shear strength is provided by the aggregate interlocking, the shear stress in the beam compression zone, and the dowel action resulting from the flexural longitudinal reinforcement ^[15]. It is generally practiced to neglect all the factors except for the concrete stress, the reason is that the effect of the other factors is relatively small.

In reinforced concrete beams with shear reinforcement, the shear strength is provided by all of the factors mentioned earlier in addition to the shear reinforcement that provided resisting shear stress to the cracking stress. Shear reinforcement when present in RC beams allows for maximum utilization of tension reinforcement, and permits a ductile failure mode rather than sudden and dangerous.

1.2 Problem Statement

The use of bent-up bars for shear reinforcement has not been so popular due to the difficulty of fabrication. However the combination of vertical shear links and bent-up bars has been used, it was not so common. In accordance with the design codes BS8110 and EC2, the bent-up bars require anchorage length that is dependent on the diameter of the bars to be used, in some cases; the anchorage could go through the concrete cover and project to the outside. In addition, the use of bent-up bars means less reinforcement is provided to resist shear and worries occur that it will not provide the needed shear capacity. This study will study the feasibility of using an independent bent-up bars system than can be fabricated and installed in a much

easier manner than the one in practice. Furthermore, the bent-up bars to be provided will have insufficient anchorage lengths in order to study if the shear capacity provided is adequate. The main purpose of this study is to foresee if the design shear capacity can be provided by the bent-up bars alone without the vertical shear links.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study are as follows:

- I. To investigate the effectiveness of using independent bent-up bars systems as shear reinforcement in rectangular beams.
- II. To study the effectiveness of bent-up bars with insufficient anchorage length for shear reinforcement.
- III. To compare the different proposed shear reinforcement alignments to a conventionally reinforced concrete beam.

1.4 Scope of the Study

Six rectangular reinforced concrete beams are going to be cast and test for the effectiveness of the proposed shear reinforcement alignments. All the beams are going to have the same size and the same longitudinal reinforcement and only differ in the shear reinforcement.

REFERENCES

- ACI Committee 318. (2005) *Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete (ACI 318-05) and Commentary (ACI 318R-05)*. Farmington Hills, MI: American Concrete Institute (ACI).
- British Standard Institute. 1997. *BS 8110. Structural Use of Concrete – Part 1: Code of Practice for Design and Construction*. London.
- European Committee for Standardization. 2004. *Eurocode 2: BS EN 1992-1-1: 2004. Design of Concrete Structures – Part 1-1: General Rules and Rules for Buildings*. London.
- Karim S. Rebeiz, Member, ASCE, Javier Fente, and Michael A. Frabizzio (2001) *Effect of Variables on Shear Strength of Concrete Beams*. *JOURNAL OF MATERIALS IN CIVIL ENGINEERING*, pp. 467-470.
- Kumar D. *Shear strength of R.C.C. beams without web reinforcement*. P.G M.Tech Lecturer, Dept. of Civil Engg. Govt. Engg. College, Palakkad [Lecture Notes Found Online]
- Lei Yua, Yi Cheb , Xinfeng Zhengc, Jinxin Gong d and Yupu Song (2011) *Effect of Beam Depth and Longitudinal Reinforcement Ratio on Shear Strength of RC Beams*. *Advanced Materials Research*, Vols. 163-167 (2011) pp 1460-1465.
- Mohamed Zakaria, Tamon Ueda, Zhimin Wu, and Liang Meng, (2009) *Experimental investigation on shear cracking Behavior in reinforced concrete beams with shear reinforcement*. *Journal of advanced concrete technology*. Vol 7, pp. 79-96.
- Prab Bhatt, Thomas J. MacGinely and Seng Choo (2006). *Reinforced concrete design theory and examples*. Taylor & Francis, 2006 - 686 pages
- Wen-Yao Lu (2006). *Shear strength prediction for steel reinforced concrete deep beams*. *Journal of constructional steel research*. Vol 62, pp.933-942

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ang Ting Guan (2008) The influence of the anchorage of independent bent-up bars on its shear capacity. Degree of Master of Engineering (Civil-Structure) Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

Noor Azlina BT Abdul Hamid (2005) The use of horizontal and inclined bars as shear reinforcement. Degree of Master of Engineering (Civil-Structure) Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

Noor Nabilah Binti Sarbini (2009) The effectiveness of independent bent-up bars with insufficient anchorage and inclined links as shear reinforcement. Degree of Master of Engineering (Civil-Structure) Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.